

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	San Bernardino County Flood Control District	Amount Requested	\$5,719,581
------------------	--	-------------------------	-------------

Proposal Title	Cactus Basin No. 3 Stormwater Flood Reduction Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$12,439,162
-----------------------	---	----------------------------	--------------

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project goal is to reduce flooding in the City of Rialto, and eventually provide additional groundwater recharge. The project will improve the stormwater retention capacity of existing Cactus Basin 3 by widening and deepening the basin. An earthen dam and concrete spillway will be constructed on the downstream side of the basin. In addition to increasing the basin's stormwater retention capacity, the basin will be modified to maximize groundwater recharge.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	6/15	Technical Justification	4/10
Budget	2/5		
Schedule	4/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	18/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			42

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criteria are marginally addressed, and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The descriptions of tasks provided in the proposal for the project are not of adequate detail and completeness. In particular, Task 9 (Construction) does not include details on the amount of excavation, size of outlet pipes and structures, and construction of spillway and embankments.

BUDGET

Budgets for the projects in the Proposal do not have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, or supporting documentation is lacking. For example, \$10,000 is budgeted for preparing the final Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, which is sufficient for the document, but an allocation for the implementation of the plan was not found. A number of contingencies have been built into the budget.

Contingencies appear to be nearly 25% of the budget. This seems excessive given the status of design (95%). The addition of the contingencies may explain why the total project cost varies in the application (~\$9,000,000 and ~\$12,000,000), and the match amount is miscalculated.

SCHEDULE

Schedule is somewhat consistent with the work plan and budget, demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation no later than October 2015. The breakdown of tasks for the schedule is not consistent with breakdown provided in the work plan. Some of the tasks lack documentation or rationales and incomplete or insufficient. Environmental compliance is listed as occurring for 1 day in July 2010. Project long term monitoring shows up in the schedule but is not mentioned in the work plan.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is complete and insufficient. Although the identified performance targets are appropriate for some of the benefits claimed, how the performance will be measured is not adequately addressed for all the benefits. Measurement tools chosen do not seem to match the numeric targets provided. Numeric targets and measurement tools for the following physical benefits claimed are not discussed at all in this section: improving water quality, enhancing groundwater recharge, and enhancing recreational opportunities

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

Technical justification cannot be determined due to a lack of documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project and physical benefits are not well described. Inconsistency in reporting physical benefits are presented throughout the application. The narrative description of physical benefits does not reference supporting documentation or, in some cases, quantify or provide justification for the benefit claimed. Many technical documents are attached. The narrative section for Attachment 7 does not reference specific chapters, text, or studies to back up any information but rather supplies a list of attached technical documents. No table summarizing with/without project difference for physical benefits is included in Attachment 7.

BENEFITS AND COSTS ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium to high level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. Total project cost is \$11.9 million in net present value (NPV). The Applicant used FRAM to evaluate avoided damages from three flood events: 10-year, 25-year, and 100-year. Annual benefit (reduction of Estimated Annual Damage) with versus without project) is \$19.67 million. This results in Flood Damage Reduction benefits of \$304 million in NPV. Additional non-monetized benefits are briefly described, including recreation, wildlife habitat, and groundwater recharge.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that 6 program preferences and 7 statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, the applicant demonstrates this with a high degree of certainty, and adequately documents the magnitude and breadth to which each will be achieved for 6 of the preferences claimed. The proposal will achieve the following: 1) Include regional projects or programs; 2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region; 3) Effectively integrate water management with land use planning; 4) Expand Environmental Stewardship; 5) Practice Integrated Flood Management; and 6) Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality.